



Official

### REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Lamarre for holding the interview of July 9, 2003. At that time, Examiner Lemarre indicated that claims 1 and 2 as amended in the Response of June 26, 2003 would likely be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 failing to be directed to patentable subject matter, as essentially each disclose an algorithm. In order to place the two claims in condition for allowance, Examiner Lamarre suggested further amending the claims to provide associated structure. Applicants amend claims 1 and 2 to respectively recite methods for interleaving and de-interleaving that are each performed by a claimed storing unit and a claimed control unit, and respectfully submit that claim 1 and 2 are thereby in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that independent claims 1 - 3, 10, 17 - 20, 23, 24, 31, 32, 35, 36, 43, 46 and 49, and the claims that depend therefrom, stand in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

**DRAFT**

Any fees due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Thomas J. Bean  
Reg. No. 44,528

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN  
575 MADISON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-2585  
PHONE: (212) 940-8800/FAX: (212) 940-8776  
DOCKET No.: FUJS 16.073 (100794-11203)